



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/513,704	02/25/2000	Tuomo Hokkanen	2132-25PCON	7280

7590 12/01/2003

Lance J Lieberman Esq
Cohen Pontani Lieberman & Pavane
Suite 1210
551 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10176

EXAMINER

NALVEN, ANDREW L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

14

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/513,704

Applicant(s)

HOKKANEN ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew Naalven

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are pending.
2. The IDS received on 2/25/2000 has been received and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinz US Patent No. 5,812,764 in view of Dean et al US Patent No 6,223,292. Heinz discloses a password management system over a communications network.
5. With regards to claims 1 and 6, Heinz discloses providing the user of a service with a set of expendable passwords for remotely accessing a service via a network (Heinz, column 4, lines 1-4 and column 6, lines 44-52) and the storing of the provided passwords on the terminal device of the user (Heinz, column 4, lines 8-13). A connection is set up via the network from the terminal to the server to enable use of the service (Heinz, column 5, lines 34-46). Heinz further discloses the receiving of a setup signal and the validation of the password at the server for either allowing or denying

access (Heinz, column 6, lines 1-12). Heinz lacks a reference to the terminal automatically selecting from the stored set of expendable passwords and transmitting the password as a portion of a connection setup signal. Dean teaches an authorization system for computer products. Dean discloses the transmission of a password as a portion of a setup signal (Dean, column 5, lines 29-31 and Figure 10). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Dean's method of using a terminal selected password as a portion of a setup signal because it offers the advantage of allowing the server to determine if a user is authorized and whether the usage of the content is within predetermined policies relating to the use of the content (Dean, column 1, lines 34-43).

6. With regards to claims 2 and 7, Heinz discloses the registering at the terminal of each stored password once it has been used to log-on (Heinz, column 6, lines 13-17).

7. With regards to claims 3 and 8, Heinz discloses the updating of expendable passwords stored on the terminal device by transmitting a new set from the server to the terminal (Heinz, column 6, lines 44-48 and Figure 3).

8. With regards to claims 4 and 9, Heinz discloses the automatic ordering of a new set of passwords by the terminal to the server when all of the passwords have been used (Heinz, column 6, lines 48-54).

9. Claims 5 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinz US Patent No. 5,812,764 and Dean et al US Patent No 6,223,292 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nielsen US Patent No. 6,006,333. Heinz and

Dean, as described above, fail to teach the existence of more than one set of passwords corresponding to a plurality of remotely accessible services. Nielsen teaches a password helper for presenting appropriate client passwords to remote servers. Nielsen discloses a database of passwords corresponding to different remote servers (Nielsen, column 3, lines 64-66) and a means for selecting one of the set of passwords corresponding to the service being accessed by the user for use in logging-in (Nielsen, column 4 line 57 – column 5 line 3). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Nielsen's method of storing multiple passwords corresponding to different remote server services because it offers the advantage of allowing authentication to a plurality of services without the user having to enter a password for each access to the plurality of remote servers (Nielsen, column 1, lines 31-55).

10. Claims 12-14, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinz US Patent No. 5,812,764 and Dean et al US Patent No 6,223,292 as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Sormunen et al US Patent No. 6,113,078.

11. With regards to claim 12, Heinz and Dean fail to teach a wired network using a telephone. Sormunen discloses a telecommunications network using a telephone (Sormunen, column 6, lines 58-67). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Sormunen's method of using a wired telecommunications network because it offers the advantage of being

able to use email as a method of transmitting information (Sormunen, column 5, lines 63-67).

12. With regards to claims 13 and 14, Heinz and Dean fail to teach the network being a mobile network using GSM. Sormunen discloses a mobile GSM network using GSM terminals (Sormunen, column 3, lines 12-31. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Sormunen's method of incorporating GSM terminals and networks because it offers the advantage of providing enciphered transmissions and fast data transfer (Sormunen, column 3, lines 36-41).

13. With regards to claim 18, Heinz and Dean disclose the updating of expendable passwords stored on the terminal device by transmitting a new set from the server to the terminal at the request of the terminal (Heinz, column 6, lines 44-48 and Figure 3). Heinz and Dean fail to teach the use of short message service to send a request for a password. Sormunen discloses the use of short message service for use in requesting a password (Sormunen, column 3, lines 54-60). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Sormunen's method of requesting a password with short message service messages because it offers the advantage of encrypting the messages and prevents outsiders from deciphering the request or the returned passwords (Sormunen, column 3, lines 65-67).

14. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinz US Patent No. 5,812,764, Dean et al US Patent No 6,223,292, and

Sormunen et al US Patent No. 6,113,078 as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Nielsen US Patent No. 6,006,333. Heinz, Dean, and Sormunen, as described above, fail to teach the existence of a directory service storing information corresponding to a plurality of remotely accessible services. Nielsen discloses a database of passwords corresponding to different remote servers (Nielsen, column 3, lines 64-66) and service identifiers and password names corresponding to the service being accessed by the user for use in logging-in (Nielsen, column 4 line 57 – column 5 line 3). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Nielsen's method of storing multiple passwords corresponding to different remote server services because it offers the advantage of allowing authentication to a plurality of services without user intervention (Nielsen, column 2, lines 12-27).

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

16. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

17. The cited prior art fails to teach the limitations of claim 15 that disclose software on the subscriber identity module further comprising means for identifying the service by

Art Unit: 2134

a telephone number entered by the user at the terminal device to access the service and adding means further comprising means for appending to the telephone number a predetermined number of digits characterizing the one of the stored passwords selected by the selecting means.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

19. Any inquiry regarding this communication from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Nalven at (703) 305-8407 during the hours of 7:15 AM – 4:45 PM Monday through Thursday. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

In the event that attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (703) 308 – 4789.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 872-9306 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 09/513,704
Art Unit: 2134

Page 8

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Andrew Nalven

ALN

Matthew D. Smithers
MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2134